soitte sweet, and the like, so that all bodies whatsoever had some of all sorts of these atoms (which are in a manner infinite) specifically differing from One an Other ill them. Vav *iv travrl* |U£/xi)(0cu, Stort *TTOV SK* Tray-roc y/vcrai, <J>aiv£cr0ai §e Sia^spovra, /cat *Trpocrayo* p£V£&9ai erepa* aXX'i? Xjwv £/c *TOV* /uaXeara vTrepe^ovroc Stct TO *7r|rj9og* fv r?J jjt^si rwv aVa'f a>v, &C. That all things were in every thing mingled together, because they saw, that every thing was made of every thing; but that things seemed to differ from one another, and were denominated to be this or that, from those atoms, which are most predominant in the mixture, by reason of their multiplicity:— whence he concluded, that all the generations, corruptions, and alterations of bodies were made by nothing but the concretions ai^d secretion^ of inexistent and pre-existent atoms of different forms and qualities, without the production of any new form and quality out of nothing, or the reduction of any into nothing. This vdry account Aristotle gives of the Anaxagorean hypothesis: *"Ava£,ayopa£* ovrwc *airsipa* oi??07?ycu *ra o-roiy^ela, Sia TO* XttyijSavav, *ryv Koivrjv* 8o.^v TWV *fyvaiKwv etvai* .0X17.6^ tJc *ov ywomevov* oJSgvoc f/c TOV *firi ovrpg.* Anaxagoras seemeth, therefore, to make infinite atoms endued with several forms and qualities to be the elements of bodies, because he supposed that common opinion of physiologers to be true, that nothing is made of nothing.— But all the other ancient physiologers that were before Aiiaxagoras, and likewise those after him, who, insisting upon the same principle of nothing coming from nothing, did not Anaxagorize, as Empedocles, De-.mocritus, and Protagoras, must needs make o

Ibid
. K
2